

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6-13 are presented for consideration, with Claim 1 being independent.

An editorial change has been made to Claim 1.

Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Suzuki '361. In addition, Claims 7, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Suzuki in view of Sarrasin '000. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicants' invention relates to an image display apparatus comprised of electron-emitting devices driven in a matrix by a plurality of row wirings and column wirings, a scanning circuit for sequentially selecting and scanning the row wirings, and a modulation circuit for applying a modulated signal to the column wirings. In addition, a voltage drop compensation circuit calculates corrected image data for reducing an influence of voltage drops due to at least resistance components of the row wirings, with respect to image data. As claimed, the modulation circuit generates a modulated signal by modulating both a pulse width and a voltage amplitude. The voltage drop compensation circuit includes an effective voltage calculating circuit for finding an effective voltage value on the basis of the image data, with the effective voltage value being a value obtained by averaging in a time direction a voltage amplitude value of the modulated signal corresponding to the image data for one horizontal scanning period, and a compensation value calculating circuit for calculating a compensation value for reducing an influence of voltage drops due to at least resistance components of the row

wirings, with respect to the effective voltage value. The modulation circuit outputs a modulated signal on the basis of the corrected image data.

The patent to Suzuki relates to an electron beam generating device that is said to include a scanning circuit 202, a modulation circuit 209, and a voltage drop compensation circuit 206, 207 and 208. In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, however, it is submitted that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest at least the modulation circuit and the effective voltage calculating circuit as set forth in Applicants' Claim 1.

The modulation circuit in Applicants' Claim 1 generates a modulated signal by modulating both a pulse width and a voltage amplitude, whereas Suzuki discloses, merely, that the modulating signal generator 209 is a "circuit of a voltage modulating type" or a circuit of a "pulse width modulating type" (see column 12, lines 67 through column 13, line 11). Although the Office Action asserts that Suzuki's modulation circuit generates a modulated signal by modulating both a pulse width and a voltage amplitude, no support is provided for this assertion.

It follows, then, that without providing the modulated circuit as set forth in Claim 1, Suzuki also fails to teach or suggest an effective voltage calculating circuit for finding an effective voltage value by averaging in a time direction a voltage amplitude value of the modulated signal corresponding to the image data for one horizontal scanning period. As understood, Suzuki uses a one line average luminance per element ($I_{\text{avg1}} = I_{\text{total1}}/n$) as discussed beginning in column 11, line 66, and thus cannot be said to teach or suggest finding an effective voltage value by averaging in a time direction a voltage amplitude value of the modulated signal corresponding to the image data for one horizontal scanning period.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Suzuki fails to anticipate or render obvious Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Sarrasin is directed to a display device and is cited to compensate for the deficiencies in Suzuki with respect to Claims 7, 10 and 13. Sarrasin fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Suzuki with respect to independent Claim 1. The proposed combination of art, therefore, even if proper, still fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 6-13 set forth additional features of Applicants' invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicants respectfully request a personal interview in the subject application.

Applicants' undersigned representative will contact the Examiner to request an interview within two weeks. Should the application be taken up for examination before that time, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' undersigned representative be contacted at the telephone number listed below.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vnm

FCHS_WS 2136137v1